

United States Patent and Trademark Office

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450 www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO
10/643,412	08/18/2003	Gerhard Hugenschutt	364/112	3440
7:	590 07/16/2004		EXAMINER	
KENYON & KENYON One Broadway			LIN, ING HOUR	
New York, NY 10004			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
			1725	
			DATE MAILED: 07/16/2004	

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

	Application No.	Applicant(s)	1			
	10/643,412	HUGENSCHUTT ET AL.	į.			
Office Action Summary	Examiner	Art Unit				
	Ing-Hour Lin	1725				
The MAILING DATE of this communication app Period for Reply	ears on the cover sheet with the c	orrespondence address	<u> </u>			
A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION. - Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.13 after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication. - If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply if NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period was railure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).	36(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timed within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from cause the application to become ABANDONE	nely filed s will be considered timely. the mailing date of this communication.				
Status						
1) Responsive to communication(s) filed on 18 Au	<u>igust 2003</u> .					
2a)☐ This action is FINAL . 2b)⊠ This	action is non-final.					
3) Since this application is in condition for allowar closed in accordance with the practice under E						
Disposition of Claims						
4) Claim(s) 1-22 is/are pending in the application. 4a) Of the above claim(s) is/are withdraw 5) Claim(s) is/are allowed. 6) Claim(s) 1-22 is/are rejected. 7) Claim(s) is/are objected to. 8) Claim(s) are subject to restriction and/or						
Application Papers						
9) The specification is objected to by the Examiner						
10)☐ The drawing(s) filed on is/are: a)☐ accepted or b)☐ objected to by the Examiner.						
Applicant may not request that any objection to the d						
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction 11) The oath or declaration is objected to by the Exa						
Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119						
a) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign part All b) Some * c) None of: 1. Certified copies of the priority documents 2. Certified copies of the priority documents 3. Copies of the certified copies of the priority application from the International Bureau * See the attached detailed Office action for a list of	have been received. have been received in Application ty documents have been received (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).	n No d in this National Stage				
Attachment(s)						
1) Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) 2) Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)	4) Interview Summary (I Paper No(s)/Mail Date	PTO-413)				
3) Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08) Paper No(s)/Mail Date <u>0712</u> .		e tent Application (PTO-152)				

Art Unit: 1725

DETAILED ACTION

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

- 1. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:
 - (a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negatived by the manner in which the invention was made.
- 2. This application currently names joint inventors. In considering patentability of the claims under 35 U.S.C. 103(a), the examiner presumes that the subject matter of the various claims was commonly owned at the time any inventions covered therein were made absent any evidence to the contrary. Applicant is advised of the obligation under 37 CFR 1.56 to point out the inventor and invention dates of each claim that was not commonly owned at the time a later invention was made in order for the examiner to consider the applicability of 35 U.S.C. 103(c) and potential 35 U.S.C. 102(e), (f) or (g) prior art under 35 U.S.C. 103(a).
- 3. Claims 1-10, 12-14 and 19 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Yamasaki et al in view of Blacklin et al.

Yamasaki et al (col. 3, lines 42+) teach the claimed liquid-cooled mold for the continuous casting of metal, comprising mold members having copper facing plates 11 and supporting plates 17, wherein bolts 13a –15a are used to connect and tighten the supporting plates to the copper facing plates having cylindrical plateau pedestals

Art Unit: 1725

(tightening members) 13-15 with holes for fitting the bolts. The pedestal jut into a cooling arrangement gap formed between the copper facing plate and the supporting plate, wherein the surfaces of the plateau pedestals (tightening members) lying up against the supporting plate in planes or interfaces parallel to one another. The dimension of the copper facing plate includes thickness of 10-30mm, lateral width of 0.1 –3m and length in the casting direction of 0.7-1.5 m. Yamasaki et al fail to teach the use of streamline shape or rhombus shape for the plateau pedestals (tightening members).

However, Blacklin et al (col. 8, lines 55+ and Figs. 2-13) teach the use of streamline shape or rhombus shape or configuration for the plateau (truncated cone) pedestals in composite panel for the purpose of effectively supporting a plate in the composite panel. It would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art to provide Yamasaki et al rhombus shape for the plateau pedestals as taught by Blacklin et al in order to effectively better support the interfaces between the copper facing plate and the supporting plate.

4. Claim 11 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Yamasaki et al in view of Blacklin et al and further in view of Church et al.

Yamasaki et al in view of Blacklin et al fail teach the use of aged cooper.

However, Church et al (col. 3, lines 63+) teach the use of casting mold made of aged copper having yield strength of 615 Mpa for the purpose of promoting the high temperature creep resistance of molding plate. It would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art to provide Yamasaki et al in view of Blacklin et al an aged

Art Unit: 1725

copper plate as taught by Church et al in order to promote the high temperature creep resistance of molding plate.

5. Claims 15 and 18 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Yamasaki et al in view of Blacklin et al and further in vie of Grove.

Yamasaki et al in view of Blacklin et al fail to teach the use of a sliding aid.

However, Grove (col. 4, lines 23+) teaches the use of a sliding aid, comprising a disc-shaped spring washer 56 and gaskets of steel or foam 58 used under clamping bolt (nut) 60 for fastening mounting studs 50 for the purpose of allowing three dimensional displacements of the copper facing plates 28 and steel supporting plates 32 and for minimizing the thermal stress exerted on the copper facing plates 28 by the steel supporting plates 32. It would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art to provide Yamasaki et al in view of Blacklin et al a sliding aid as taught by Grove in order to improve the relative movement between the copper facing plates and steel supporting plates.

6. Claims 16-17 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Yamasaki et al in view of Blacklin et al and further in vie of Bower.

Yamasaki et al in view of Blacklin et al fail to teach the use of friction-reducing material.

However, Bower (col. 2, lines 8+) teach the use of friction-reducing material including polytetrafluoroethylene (Teflon), graphite and molybdenum desulfide for the purpose of effectively reducing the coefficient of friction opposing relative movement

Art Unit: 1725

between copper facing plates 10 and steel supporting plates 12 to a maximum value of about 0.1. It would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art to provide Yamasaki et al in view of Blacklin et al the friction-reducing material as taught by Bower in order to improve the relative movement between the copper facing plates and steel supporting plates.

7. Claims 20-22 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Yamasaki et al in view of Blacklin et al and further in vie of Ushio et al and Ishida.

Yamasaki et al in view of Blacklin et al fails to teach the use of coating on the copper plate. However, Ushio et al (col. 1, lines 49+) teach the need of diffusion barrier and the use of Ni coating having the properties of wear resistance; and the thickness of coating layer increases with the casting direction for purpose of effectively protecting the copper plate from the attack of cast steel. Further, Ishida (col. 2, lines 65+) teaches the use of tungsten alloy of thick ness between 0.1 and 2 mm containing WC and Ni alloy as a coating for the purpose of enhancing corrosion resistance (diffusion barrier) and wear resistance. It would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art to provide Grove in view of Bower et al the use of coating alloys as taught respectively by of Ushio et al and Ishida in order to protect the copper plate during casting steel.

Conclusion

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Ing-Hour Lin whose telephone number is (571) 272-1180. The examiner can normally be reached on M-F (8:00-5:30) Second Friday Off.

Art Unit: 1725

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Tom Dunn can be reached on (571) 272-1171. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 703-872-9306.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see http://pair-direct.uspto.gov. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

Ill di

Kiley Stoner AU 1725 Kly Stone 7/14/04

I.-H.Lin

7-12-04